

REMARKS

This amendment is filed as a submission with the filing of the RCE subsequent to the receipt of the Advisory Action dated December 7, 2006 advising applicant that the After Final Amendment filed October 26, 2006 in response to the Office Action dated August 11, 2006 will not be entered.

Entry of the remarks of the August 11, 2006 amendment is requested, and the remarks made therein for responding to the rejection of those claims not being addressed in particular herein are incorporated by reference hereto.

Per the above amendment, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include the feature "a polling signal at a quasi communication area has an electric field strength between a first electric field strength and a second electric field strength larger than the first electric field strength, and a polling signal at a standard communication area has an electric field strength equal to or higher than the second electric field strength", and the feature "the polling signal is received by an on-vehicle device when the electric field strength of the polling signal at a position of the on-vehicle device is larger than a strength between the first electric field strength and the second electric field strength, and the on-vehicle device passes from the quasi communication area to the standard communication area during the responses". It is respectfully submitted that this amendment is supported by illustrations of Fig. 7 and corresponding descriptions in the present specification.

Claims 2 and 14 have been amended to include the feature "a portion of a vehicle is detected at a first position of a standard communication area on a lane when an on-vehicle device of the vehicle is placed in the standard communication area or a quasi communication area", the feature "the portion of the vehicle is detected at a second position of the standard communication area when the on-vehicle device is placed in the standard communication area", the feature "a continuous transmission of a polling signal is started when a vehicle at the first position is detected", and the feature "an electric field


strength of the polling signal at the quasi communication area is between a first electric field strength and a second electric field strength larger than the first electric field strength, and the electric field strength of the polling signal at the standard communication area is equal to or higher than the second electric field strength".

Incorporating the differences that were discussed in the October 26, 2006 amendment, another of the differences between the present invention defined by the amended claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 and the combination of Rochester (US5687175) and Steeves (US6570487) is the following:

Neither Rochester nor Steeves discloses a standard communication area or a quasi communication area.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1, 2, 12 and 13, as well as all the other claims pending in the application, are clearly distinguishable from the teachings of Rochester, even in combination with Steeves. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should therefore be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis Woo, RN 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 299-4090

Date: Jan 24, 2007